

REMARKS

This communication responds to the Office Action mailed on October 6, 2005. Claims 1, 8-12, 14, 19, and 23-25 are amended, claims 2, 4, 7, 18, and 22 are canceled, and no claims are added. As a result, claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-17, 19-21, and 23-25 are now pending in this Application. The Applicant's representative, Mark V. Muller, respectfully requests the benefit of an Examiner's Interview in this matter after the Examiner has had a chance to review this document if the Examiner is not persuaded that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the label "327" as a reference label included in FIG. 3 but not mentioned in the specification. The specification has been amended to include the label "327". No new matter has been added, and it is believed that the amendment made herein rectifies the labeling issue noted in the Office Action. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review in this regard.

Objections to the Specification and the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the specification and to the Abstract due to informalities. It is believed that the amendments made to the specification and to the Abstract herein obviate said objections, and render them moot.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-11, 14-16 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kinnunen et al. (U.S. 2001/0018349). Given the amendments to the independent claims, it is believed the rejection of claims 1-11, 14-16, and 18-21 under 35 USC § 102(e) is moot. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. in view of Chern et al. (U.S. 6,381,465). Claim 13 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. in view of Stewart et al. (U.S. 6,414,635). Claims 22-24 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. in view of Purdani et al. (U.S. 6,556,824). Claim 25 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen et al. in view of Purdani et al. and further in view of Evans et al. (U.S. 6,327,535). Given the amendments to the independent claims, it is believed the rejection of claims 12-13, 17, and 22-25 under 35 USC § 103(a) is moot. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's attorney, Mark Muller at (210) 308-5677, or the Applicants' below-named attorney at (612) 349-9592 to facilitate prosecution of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER WOLOCHOW ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Dec. 6, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 6th day of December 2005.

Amy Moriarty

Name

Signature

